

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are pending and under consideration.

A telephonic interview was conducted between the Examiner and the Applicant's representative on July 7, 2006. The Examiner is thanked for his time. In the interview, the Applicant noted that due to the withdrawal of the previous allowance, the Applicant has not received feedback from the Examiner regarding the feature of the undulating surface, recited in the amendment of October 3, 2005. The Examiner suggested that the Applicant re-submit these arguments.

It is noted that the objected to claims listed at page 2 of the Office Action have already been amended into independent form.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully traversed. Independent claim 1 recites a container receiving the transformer therein and having a cover body having an undulating surface. Present FIG. 1A illustrates these features, for example.

Ito discloses a transformer 2 (FIGS. 1 and 3) and a heating member 34 to heat a transformer 35 (FIG. 10). It is noted that FIGS. 1, 3 and 5 of Ito do not illustrate any container to contain the transformer 35. Instead, FIGS. 1, 3 and 10 are circuit diagrams, which generally show the transformer 35 and associated elements symbolically. Thus, the claimed cover body having an undulating surface is not illustrated.

Harms teaches a transformer 182, however, this element is illustrated schematically and thus an undulating surface of the transformer 182 is not taught.

Independent claim 11 recites the surface of the container comprising a plurality of undulations to increase a surface area thereof so that a majority of heat emitted by the transformer is emitted to an outside of the container through the surface.

As discussed above, Ito and Harms do not teach undulations. Furthermore, it is noted that Harms teaches that the magnetron 18 heats oil and then the heated oil is transported to a radiator 34, remote from the magnetron. In contrast, the heat in claim 11 is emitted through the surface of the container, and thus the additional construction necessary for remote heat transfer is not required.

Kim does not overcome these deficiencies.

The remaining independent claims are patentable over the cited references at least for similar reasons as discussed with respect to independent claims 1 or 11.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this response, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 9-1-06

By: 
Michael J. Badagliacca
Registration No. 39,099

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501